

AO 120 (Rev. 2/99)

<b>TO: Mail Stop 8</b> <b>Director of the U.S. Patent &amp; Trademark Office</b> <b>P.O. Box 1450</b> <b>Alexandria, VA 22313-1450</b>	<b>REPORT ON THE</b> <b>FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN</b> <b>ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR</b> <b>TRADEMARK</b>
---	---

In Compliance with 35 § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been  
 filed in the U.S. District Court \_\_\_\_\_ on the following ☒ Patents or ☐ Trademarks:

DOCKET NO. CV 12-03293 NC	DATE FILED 6/28/12	U.S. DISTRICT COURT 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 16 <sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94102
PLAINTIFF CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.		DEFENDANT ALBERTA TELECOMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH CENTRE
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK
1 SEE COMPLAINT	<i>DGS. 3</i>	
2		
3		
4		
5		

In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included:

DATE INCLUDED	INCLUDED BY <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Answer <input type="checkbox"/> Cross Bill <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pleading		
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued:

DECISION/JUDGEMENT
--------------------

CLERK Richard W. Wieking	(BY) DEPUTY CLERK Alfred Amistoso	DATE July 2, 2012
-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------

Copy 1—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Commissioner    Copy 3—Upon termination of action, mail this copy to Commissioner  
 Copy 2—Upon filing document adding patent(s), mail this copy to Commissioner    Copy 4—Case file copy

1           48.     As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a  
2 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a  
3 declaratory judgment.

4                   **COUNT V (NON-INFRINGEMENT OF THE '543 PATENT)**

5           49.     Cisco restates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 48 and incorporates them  
6 by reference as though set forth fully herein.

7           50.     No claim of the '543 patent has been or is infringed, either directly or indirectly,  
8 by Cisco or its customers through their use of Cisco's products in their telecommunications  
9 networks.

10          51.     As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a  
11 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a  
12 declaratory judgment.

13                   **COUNT VI (INVALIDITY OF THE '543 PATENT)**

14          52.     Cisco restates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 51 and incorporates them  
15 by reference as though set forth fully herein.

16          53.     The claims of the '543 patent are invalid for failure to comply with the  
17 requirements of the patent laws of the United States, including but not limited to the provisions  
18 of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

19          54.     As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a  
20 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a  
21 declaratory judgment.

22                   **COUNT VII (NON-INFRINGEMENT OF THE '734 PATENT)**

23          55.     Cisco restates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 54 and incorporates them  
24 by reference as though set forth fully herein.

56. No claim of the '734 patent has been or is infringed, either directly or indirectly, by Cisco or its customers through their use of Cisco's products in their telecommunications networks.

57. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

**COUNT VIII (INVALIDITY OF THE '734 PATENT)**

58. Cisco restates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 57 and incorporates them by reference as though set forth fully herein.

59. The claims of the '734 patent are invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of the patent laws of the United States, including but not limited to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

60. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

**COUNT IX (NON-INFRINGEMENT OF THE '349 PATENT)**

61. Cisco restates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 60 and incorporates them by reference as though set forth fully herein.

62. No claim of the '349 patent has been or is infringed, either directly or indirectly, by Cisco or its customers through their use of Cisco's products in their telecommunications networks.

63. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60
- 61
- 62
- 63
- 64
- 65
- 66
- 67
- 68
- 69
- 70
- 71
- 72
- 73
- 74
- 75
- 76
- 77
- 78
- 79
- 80
- 81
- 82
- 83
- 84
- 85
- 86
- 87
- 88
- 89
- 90
- 91
- 92
- 93
- 94
- 95
- 96
- 97
- 98
- 99
- 100

65. The claims of the '349 patent are invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of the patent laws of the United States, including but not limited to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

**COUNT XI (NON-INFRINGEMENT OF THE '880 PATENT)**

68. No claim of the '880 patent has been or is infringed, either directly or indirectly, by Cisco or its customers through their use of Cisco's products in their telecommunications networks.

**COUNT XII (INVALIDITY OF THE '880 PATENT)**

71. The claims of the '880 patent are invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of the patent laws of the United States, including but not limited to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

72. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

**COUNT XIII (NON-INFRINGEMENT OF THE '059 PATENT)**

73. Cisco restates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 72 and incorporates them by reference as though set forth fully herein.

74. No claim of the '059 patent has been or is infringed, either directly or indirectly, by Cisco or its customers through their use of Cisco's products in their telecommunications networks.

75. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

**COUNT XIV (INVALIDITY OF THE '059 PATENT)**

76. Cisco restates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 75 and incorporates them by reference as though set forth fully herein.

77. The claims of the '059 patent are invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of the patent laws of the United States, including but not limited to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

78. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that this Court grant the following relief:

1. A declaration that Cisco and its customers have not infringed and are not infringing, either directly or indirectly, any claim of the '835, '505, '543, '734, '349, '880, and '059 patents;

1           2.       A declaration that each claim of the '835, '505, '543, '734, '349, '880, and '059  
2 patents is invalid;


3           3.       An order that Defendants and each of their officers, employees, agents, attorneys,  
4 and any persons in active concert or participation with them are restrained and enjoined from  
5 further prosecuting or instituting any action against Cisco or its customers claiming that the '835,  
6 '505, '543, '734, '349, '880, and '059 patents are infringed or from representing that Cisco's  
7 products or their use in the networks operated by Cisco's customers infringe the '835, '505, '543,  
8 '734, '349, '880, and '059 patents.

9           4.       A declaration that this case is exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and awarding  
10 Cisco its attorneys' fees and costs in connection with this case; and

11          5.       Such other relief as the Court deems appropriate.

12  
13                               Respectfully submitted,

14  
15                               WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND  
16                               DORR LLP

17                                 
18                               Keith L. Slenkovich (CBN: 129793)

19                               Jane Y. Huang (CBN: 267754)  
20                               WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
21                               HALE AND DORR LLP  
22                               950 Page Mill Road  
23                               Palo Alto, CA 94304  
24                               (650) 858-6000

25                               Attorneys for Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc.


26  
27                               June 26, 2012

1                                    **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

2                    Plaintiffs demand a jury trial for all issues so triable.

3                                    Respectfully submitted,

4                                    WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND  
5                                    DORR LLP

6                                    

7                                    Keith L. Slenkovich (CBN: 129793)

8                                    Jane Y. Huang (CBN: 267754)

9                                    WILMER CUTLER PICKERING

10                                  HALE AND DORR LLP

11                                  950 Page Mill Road

12                                  Palo Alto, CA 94304

13                                  (650) 858-6000

14                                  *Attorneys for Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc.*

15                    June 26, 2012

1 Keith L. Slenkovich (CBN: 129793)  
2 Jane Y. Huang (CBN: 267754)  
3 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
4 HALE AND DORR LLP  
5 950 Page Mill Road  
6 Palo Alto, CA 94304  
7 (650) 858-6000

ORIGINAL FILED

JUL 2 2017

RECEIVED  
CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE

ADR

8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 ALBERTA TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
14 RESEARCH CENTRE d/b/a TR LABS  
15 and TR TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

16 Defendants.

CV 12-03293

C.A. No. \_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY  
JUDGMENT**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

NC

17  
18 Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc. ("Cisco") by and through its attorneys brings this action for  
19 a declaratory judgment and alleges as follows:

20 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

21 Cisco is a worldwide leader in the development of the networking equipment that  
22 underlies today's modern telecommunications infrastructure. Cisco's customers include leading  
23 telecommunications providers who have used Cisco's products to build a high speed, reliable  
24 network infrastructure for the delivery of voice and data content such as AT&T, Qwest (now  
25 CenturyLink), Windstream, Comcast, Sprint, Cox, tw telecom, and Level 3. Defendants Alberta  
26 Telecommunications Research Centre d/b/a TR Labs ("TR Labs") and TR Technologies, Inc.



1 (“TR Tech”) (collectively, “Defendants”) have accused Cisco’s customers of infringing at least  
2 seven of its patents through use of Cisco’s products in their telecommunications networks. To  
3 date, TR Labs has sued at least six of Cisco’s customers in actions currently pending in the  
4 District of New Jersey (C.A. No. 09-cv-3883) and the District of Colorado (C.A. No. 12-cv-581).  
5 In addition, Defendants have sent letters to other customers relating to their use of Cisco’s  
6 products in their networks and threatening to file suit on the same patents. Defendants’  
7 allegations of infringement arising from the use of Cisco’s products are unwarranted, and Cisco  
8 brings this declaratory judgment action to free its customers, its product lines, and itself from  
9 these unwarranted allegations of patent infringement.

## 10 **PARTIES**

11 1. Plaintiff Cisco is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State  
12 of California with its principal place of business at 170 West Tasman Drive, San Jose, California  
13 95134.

14 2. Upon information and belief, Defendant TR Labs is a research consortium  
15 organized and existing under the laws of Canada, with its principal place of business at 9107  
16 116th Street, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

17 3. Upon information and belief, Defendant TR Tech is a corporation organized and  
18 existing under the laws of Canada with its principal place of business at 9107 116th Street,  
19 Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

## 20 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

### 21 **Cisco’s Products**

22 4. Cisco is a worldwide leader in the development of networking products. Cisco  
23 provides its networking products to telecommunications customers who deploy them in their  
24 own networks.

25 5. Cisco’s product line includes its ONS 15454 multiservice platforms and CRS-1  
26 routers.

1 **Defendants' Patents**

2 6. U.S. Patent No. 4,956,835 ("the '835 patent") is entitled "Method and apparatus  
3 for self-restoring and self-provisioning communication networks" and issued on September 11,  
4 1990. A copy of the '835 patent is attached as Exhibit A.

5 7. U.S. Patent No. 5,850,505 ("the '505 patent") is entitled "Method for  
6 preconfiguring a network to withstand anticipated failures" and issued on December 15, 1998. A  
7 copy of the '505 patent is attached as Exhibit B.

8 8. U.S. Patent No. 6,377,543 ("the '543 patent") is entitled "Path restoration of  
9 networks" and issued on April 23, 2002. A copy of the '543 patent is attached as Exhibit C.

10 9. U.S. Patent No. 6,404,734 ("the '734 patent") is entitled "Scalable network  
11 restoration device" and issued on June 11, 2002. A copy of the '734 patent is attached as Exhibit  
12 D.

13 10. U.S. Patent No. 6,421,349 ("the '349 patent") is entitled "Distributed  
14 preconfiguration of spare capacity in closed paths for network restoration" and issued on July 16,  
15 2002. A copy of the '349 patent is attached as Exhibit E.

16 11. U.S. Patent No. 6,914,880 ("the '880 patent") is entitled "Protection of routers in  
17 a telecommunications network" and issued on July 5, 2005. A copy of the '880 patent is  
18 attached as Exhibit F.

19 12. U.S. Patent No. 7,260,059 ("the '059 patent") is entitled "Evolution of a  
20 telecommunications network from ring to mesh structure" and issued on August 21, 2007. A  
21 copy of the '059 patent is attached as Exhibit G.

22 13. TR Labs purports to be the owner by assignment of the '835, '505, '543, '734  
23 '349, '880, and '059 patents.

24 14. TR Tech purports to be the exclusive licensee of the '835, '505, '543, '734 '349,  
25 '880, and '059 patents.

1           15.     Upon information and belief, TR Labs does not commercialize any products or  
2 services embodying the '835, '505, '543, '734 '349, '880, and '059 patents.

3           16.     Upon information and belief, TR Tech does not commercialize any products or  
4 services embodying the '835, '505, '543, '734 '349, '880, and '059 patents.

5 **Actual and Threatened Litigation Involving Defendants' Patents**

6 AT&T Litigation

7           17.     On August 5, 2009, TR Labs sued AT&T Corp. ("AT&T") in the District of New  
8 Jersey (C.A. No. 09-cv-3883), alleging infringement of the '880, '349, and '059 patents.

9           18.     On January 26, 2010, TR Labs amended its complaint against AT&T to allege  
10 infringement of the '880, '349, '059, and '734 patents.

11           19.     On November 18, 2010, TR Labs again amended its complaint against AT&T to  
12 allege infringement of the '880, '059, '734, '835, and '505 patents.

13           20.     TR Labs has served infringement contentions in the AT&T litigation that identify  
14 the use of Cisco's ONS 15454 multiservice platforms in AT&T's network as infringing TR  
15 Labs's patents.

16           21.     AT&T has denied infringement of TR Labs's patents by its use of Cisco's  
17 products and has filed counterclaims seeking a declaratory judgment that TR Labs's patents are  
18 not infringed, invalid, and unenforceable.

19 Colorado Litigation

20           22.     On March 6, 2012, TR Labs sued CenturyLink, Inc. ("CenturyLink") in the  
21 District of Colorado (C.A. No. 12-cv-581) alleging infringement of the '835, '505, '543, '734  
22 '349, '880, and '059 patents (the "Colorado case").

23           23.     On April 20, 2012, TR Labs amended its complaint in the Colorado case to allege  
24 infringement of the '835, '505, '543, '734 '349, '880, and '059 patents by Qwest  
25 Communications Company, LLC, Qwest Corp. (together with Qwest Communications  
26  
27  
28

Company, LLC, “Qwest”), Windstream Corp. (“Windstream”), Sprint Nextel Corp. (“Sprint”), Comcast Corp. (“Comcast”), and Cox Communications, Inc. (“Cox”).

24. On June 20, 2012, Defendants filed a motion for leave to file a second amended complaint in the Colorado case. Defendants’ proposed second amended complaint adds TR Tech as a plaintiff and alleges infringement of the patents-in-suit by two additional defendants, tw telecom, inc. (“tw telecom”) and Level 3 Communications, Inc. (“Level 3”).

25. Defendants’ proposed second amended complaint in the Colorado case alleges that Qwest, Windstream, Sprint, Comcast, Cox, tw telecom, and Level 3 “have deployed at least Cisco ONS 15454 Multiservice platforms . . . and/or Cisco CRS-1 routers” in their telecommunications networks to “utilize the functionality of the aforementioned devices” in a manner that infringes the ’835, ’505, ’543, ’734 ’349, ’880, and/or ’059 patents. Cisco denies that its products—or their use in Cisco’s customers networks—infringes the ’835, ’505, ’543, ’734 ’349, ’880, and/or ’059 patents.

#### Threatened Litigation

26. TR Labs sent letters in March 2012 to several of Cisco’s other customers alleging that their telecommunications networks infringe TR Labs’s patents, including US Signal Company LLC.

27. Upon information and belief, TR Labs has provided claim charts to some of Cisco’s customers alleging that the use of Cisco’s products in its customers’ telecommunications infringes the ’835, ’505, ’543, ’734 ’349, ’880, and/or ’059 patents. Cisco denies that its products—or their use in Cisco’s customers’ networks—infringes the ’835, ’505, ’543, ’734, ’349, ’880, and/or ’059 patents.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

#### **Subject Matter Jurisdiction**

28. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Cisco’s request for a declaratory judgment under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202. This action arises under the patent laws of the

United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 100 *et seq.*, which are within the subject matter jurisdiction of this Court under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

29. Defendants' actual and threatened litigation alleging infringement of the '835, '505, '543, '734 '349, '880, and '059 patents by the use of Cisco's products in its customers' telecommunications networks has created an actual and justiciable controversy as to the noninfringement and invalidity of those patents.

30. Defendants' infringement allegations threaten actual and imminent injury to Cisco that can be redressed by judicial relief and that injury is of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment. Absent a declaration of noninfringement and/or invalidity, Defendants' continued wrongful assertions of infringement through the use of Cisco's products will cause Cisco irreparable harm.

#### **Personal Jurisdiction**

31. Defendants are subject to general and specific personal jurisdiction in this judicial district based upon their purposeful, systematic, and continuous contacts with California.

32. For example, Defendants have purposefully availed themselves of benefits and protection offered by courts located in the State of California. TR Labs has brought suit for patent infringement in this district no fewer than five times during the past five years: *Alberta Telecommunications Research Centre v. Texas Instruments, Inc.*, C.A. No. 09-cv-4548 (N.D. Cal.) (filed Sept. 25, 2009); *Alberta Telecommunications Research Centre v. Dell Inc.*, C.A. No. 09-cv-3400 (N.D. Cal.) (filed July 24, 2009); *Alberta Telecommunications Research Centre v. Axiom Memory Solutions, et al.*, C.A. No. 09-cv-729 (N.D. Cal.) (filed Feb. 18, 2009); *Alberta Telecommunications Research Centre v. Sony Corp., et al.*, C.A. No. 08-cv-3408 (N.D. Cal.) (filed July 15, 2008); *Alberta Telecommunications Research Centre v. Samsung Electronics Co., et al.*, C.A. No. 07-cv-2416 (N.D. Cal.) (filed May 4, 2007).

33. Upon information and belief, Defendants maintain a website at <http://www.trlabs.ca/trlabs/>, which is accessible to residents of the State of California and in this

1 district. Defendants solicit membership in their organization and offer to license their patents on  
2 their website.

3 34. Upon information and belief, Defendants maintain significant relationships with  
4 companies based in California. For example, an article dated March 1, 2012 posted on  
5 Defendants' website touts as a "success story" their "very broad and supportive relationship"  
6 with Starscriber Corporation, a company based in California. *See*  
7 <http://www.trlabs.ca/trlabs/about/successstories/paststories/03012012.html>.

8 35. Upon information and belief, Defendants have licensed or have offered to license  
9 their patents to other companies based in California or doing business in California, including  
10 several of the companies that they sued for patent infringement in this district. *See*  
11 <http://www.trlabs.ca/trlabs/about/mediaroom/news/08062009.html>.

12 **Venue**

13 36. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because a substantial part of  
14 the events giving rise to the claims at issue occurred in this judicial district and because  
15 Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction within this judicial district.

16 **COUNT I (NON-INFRINGEMENT OF THE '835 PATENT)**

17 37. Cisco restates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 36 and incorporates them  
18 by reference as though set forth fully herein.

19 38. No claim of the '835 patent has been or is infringed, either directly or indirectly,  
20 by Cisco or its customers through their use of Cisco's products in their telecommunications  
21 networks.

22 39. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a  
23 substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a  
24 declaratory judgment.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
84

40. Cisco restates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 39 and incorporates them by reference as though set forth fully herein.

41. The claims of the '835 patent are invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of the patent laws of the United States, including but not limited to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

42. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

**COUNT III (NON-INFRINGEMENT OF THE '505 PATENT)**

43. Cisco restates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 42 and incorporates them by reference as though set forth fully herein.

44. No claim of the '505 patent has been or is infringed, either directly or indirectly, by Cisco or its customers through their use of Cisco's products in their telecommunications networks.

45. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

**COUNT IV (INVALIDITY OF THE '505 PATENT)**

46. Cisco restates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 to 45 and incorporates them by reference as though set forth fully herein.

47. The claims of the '505 patent are invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of the patent laws of the United States, including but not limited to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.